

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/716,041	11/17/2000	William N. Partlo	2000-0086-1	7625
759	03/10/2003			
John R Ross Cymer Inc			EXAMINER	
Legal Department -MS/1-2A 16750 Via Del Campo Court			NGUYEN, JOSEPH H	
San Diego, CA	92127-1712		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	
		DATE MAILED: 03/10/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/716,041	PARTLO ET AL.				
Advisory Audion	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Joseph Nguyen	2815				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 25 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a ition in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire leads on the control of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION.  R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriation of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note b						
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claim	S.			
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-17</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	/	roved by the Exami	ner.			
9. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449)	$A(\mathcal{A})$				
10. Other:		EDDIE LEE				
		isory patent exam Inology center 28				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments against the two Osamu references have been fully considered and noted, however, do not overcome the rejection since these two references are good for everything they teach.